

REMARKS

The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action.

Claims 1-4, 8-17 and 19-20 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended. The added limitations are supported by the original specification, for example, para. [0022]~[0025] of the present publication. No new matter has been added. The independent claims recited by the present application are claims 1, 12 and 20.

CLAIM REJECTIONS:

A. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

THE RELEVANT LAW

The standard for anticipation, or lack of novelty under 35 U.S.C. §102, is one of strict identity to anticipate a claim for a patent and therefore render it invalid, a single prior source must contain all its essential elements. *See, e.g., Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is well settled law that anticipation is established **only if all the elements of an invention**, as stated in a patent claim, **are identically set forth in a single prior art reference**. *See e.g. Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 8-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Leen et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0050115) (hereinafter “Leen”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The claimed invention is directed to a matchmaking service for multiplayer online computer games. The claimed invention prevents collaborative users for deceit from manipulating matchmaking by conspiring together to enter a same game room. To achieve the goal, the claimed invention determines game behavior patterns of players based on the respective players' actual playing of the game, and the claimed game server filters a malicious user based on a behavior pattern reference and prohibits said malicious user from joining the game. The behavior pattern reference of the claimed invention includes a channel pattern reference and a betting pattern reference of users, said channel pattern reference indicating a number of games

that the respective users have played in game rooms of predetermined channels and said betting pattern reference indicating a number of games that the respective users have played in predetermined betting patterns, wherein a user is determined to be a malicious user when said behavior pattern reference exceeds a predetermined value.

Leen discloses a system for generating profile information for users of a gaming application based at least upon game event information. Leen further discloses provision of event management, statistics generation, user profiling services to the user. game advice, placing and settling wagers, and matching users. However, Leen does not disclose method of determining a malicious user based on a behavior pattern reference and prohibiting said malicious user from joining the game.

Applicant believes that such services of Leen do not disclose the claimed malicious user filtering method. Reconsideration of amended claims 1, 12 and 20 is requested.

Claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-17 and 19 depend upon independent claims 1 and 12 respectively. Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinct from Leen. Since claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-17 and 19 include the limitations of the respective independent claims 1 and 12, Applicant believes that claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-17 and 19 are patentably distinct from Leen as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to claims 2-4, 8-11, 13-17 and 19 in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen in view of Cordero et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0044339) (hereinafter “Cordero”).

As discussed above, Leen does not teach the claimed malicious user filtering method. Further, Leen does not teach the claimed behavior pattern reference including a channel pattern reference and a betting pattern reference of users, the channel pattern reference indicating a number of games that the respective users have played in game rooms of predetermined channels and the betting pattern reference indicating a number of games that the respective users have played in predetermined betting patterns, wherein a user is determined to be a malicious user when said behavior pattern reference exceeds a predetermined value.

Cordero teaches matchmaking functionality to enable a player to locate game servers 134 in the network 10 that satisfy player-defined requirements (e.g., game name, number of players, rules, ping time). The matchmaker server 124 of Cordero et al. matches the players to one of multiple game servers (i.e. Sx1, Sx2, Sy1, Sy2, Sy3...) based on (1) availability of the game servers and (2) the final selection of the players. However, Cordero et al. does not teach or suggest the malicious user filtering method.

Given the difference between claimed malicious user filtering method and the profiling services and matchmaking services of Leen and Cordero, Leen in combination with Cordero does not teach or suggest the limitations of the claimed invention. As such, Leen fails to disclose the limitations recited in claims 8-11 of the present application and Cordero still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Leen in reaching all the elements and limitations of the claims of the present invention. Reconsideration of the rejection to claims 8-11 in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leen.

Claim 15 depends upon independent claim 12. Applicant believes that independent claim 12 is patentably distinct from Leen. Since claim 15 includes the limitations of the independent claim 12, Applicant believes that claim 15 is patentably distinct from Leen as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to claim 15 in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

In light of the aforementioned amendments and discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's time and attention to this matter. Applicant believes no new matter has been added with any amendments that have been made. Applicant believes the claims as now provided are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this


Application of: Won Seok Yoo
Serial No.: 10/599,637
Amendment D

application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

December 23, 2009



Changhoon Lee
Reg. No. L0316
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP
190 Carondelet Plaza, Suite 600
Clayton, MO 63105
(314) 480-1500
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT